

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application now contains claims 1 through 24. Claims 14 and 20 were previously amended to require that linking group "L" be a carbon-carbon single bond or one of the preferred linking groups described at page 15, first full paragraph, of the original specification (alkylene linkage, diacyl linkage, and sulfur linkage). Claims 14 and 20 have now been further amended to limit the sulfur linkages to the most preferred -S<sub>1</sub>- and -S<sub>2</sub>-, as , as described at page 15, lines 16 and 17, of the original specification (and prior claims 6, 13, 18 and 24). Applicants submit that in making the noted claim amendments no new matter has been presented.

Claims 1 through 13 were previously deemed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 18 and 24, claiming certain compounds of Formula I (wherein Ar is mononuclear heterocyclic moiety and L is selected from specific alkylene, diacyl and sulfur linkages) and lubricating oil compositions containing same, were objected to only for depending from rejected base claims (claims 14 and 20, respectively). Claims 14 through 17 and 19 through 23 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,206,407 to Lutwack (hereinafter referred to as "the Lutwack patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,201 to Papay et al. (hereinafter "the Papay et al. patent").


The Lutwack patent is directed to certain oligomers of triazine in which triazine moieties are linked via amino, thio-alkyl or thio-amino linking groups, which compounds are described as useful antioxidants for organic functional fluids. The Papay et al. patent was cited only to establish that the use of high molecular weight dispersants, in combination with other additives, in lubricating oil compositions was known. As noted in the Advisory Action, applicants prior amendments to claims 14 and 20 were considered insufficient to overcome the rejection as the term "sulfur linkage", as defined in the present specification, could be construed to include the thio-alkyl moieties of the Lutwack patent. As noted above, Claims 14 and 20 have now been further amended to require that the soot-dispersing compounds of Formula I comprise mononuclear heterocyclic moieties linked via a carbon-carbon bond or an alkylene linkage, a diacyl linkage, or a sulfur linkages -S<sub>1</sub>- or -S<sub>2</sub>-. Such compounds are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Lutwack patent. Therefore, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 14 and 20, as well as that of claims 15 through 19, which each depend directly or indirectly from claim 14, and claims 21 through 24, which each depend, either directly or indirectly from claim

Appln. No. 10/712,932  
Amdt. dated September 18, 2007  
Supplemental Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2007

20, is neither taught nor fairly suggested by the Lutwack patent, the Papay et al. patent, or any combination thereof.

Based upon the foregoing, applicants submit that the present claims distinguish over the prior art of record and that this application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that all rejections presented under 35 USC Section 103(a) be withdrawn, and the application now be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacob M. Levine  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,509

Infineum, USA, L.P.  
1900 East Linden Avenue  
Linden, NJ 07036  
(908) 474-2418